Possibility of Inflicting Injury by Pathogen Bacteria.—A. Abels, in Gross's *Archiv,* Volume 53, discusses the possibilities of inflicting injuries by pathogen bacteria. This matter is quite pertinent on account of the germ letters which recently appeared in Chicago. That infection by this method is possible, is proved by different well established facts. At the same time the author shows how difficult the detection of such a crime is, especially when the communicated disease is epidemic or endemic in the community. Modern science allows in most cases to establish with almost absolute certainty the cause of death. Either the blood, the brain fluid or the contents of the stomach are examined with the help of chemistry, physiology or the microscope. A criminologist is generally not an expert in toxicology and bacteriology; he must rely on the advice and assistance of reputable scientists. V. v. B.

COURTS—LAWS.

A Revolution in English Criminal Procedure.—In a paper with the above title, prepared for the Berlin Society of Comparative Jurisprudence, and which appears in the *American Law Review* for September-October, 1913, Dr. T. Baty calls attention to some recent English cases in which trial judges have commented unfavorably for defendants on trial for crimes on their not giving evidence before the magistrate but reserving their defense for the trial and on refusal to answer questions by police officers and points out that this new development is in conflict with the general principle of English law that one is presumed innocent until proven guilty. He says: "It is not therefore in the sense that any new legal obligations to answer questions have been introduced, that we assert that a silent revolution has passed over English practice. No law has laid down that accused persons must make full disclosure to the prosecution on pain of condemnation or of contumacy or of fine or imprisonment. Nothing of the kind has happened. An accused is just as much at liberty as before "to keep his mouth shut." But there is a vital change in the attitude of the court to him if he does. No longer is every one presumed to be innocent until he is proven guilty. An accused who relies on the ancient privilege and says nothing which may give a handle to the prosecution will find extremely damaging things said about him at the trial, at any rate if certain judges are presiding. It has been laid down by eminent lawyers in set terms that a prisoner ought to make a full disclosure at the earliest moment to the police, in order to enable them to test his story. This development does not go back ten years."

Dr. Baty goes on to say that the earliest instance of the new attitude appears in a case at Exeter Assises in 1903 before Justice Mills where the defendant was charged with killing a policeman. On legal advice the defendant had reserved his defense and on the trial offered evidence tending to disprove the story of the prosecution. The judge said that the shortness of time which counsel had had for preparing the case might be a reason for not calling other witnesses on his behalf before the magistrate but that it was no reason for the accused not testifying himself (and, of course, submitting to cross-examination), and that the advice given was very bad; that the Criminal Evidence Act was passed for the benefit of prisoners and if the defense was an honest one, it should be given at the earliest possible stage. Accused persons were for the